

Application No.: 09/746,602  
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111 dated May 26, 2004  
Response to the Office Action of February 27, 2004

### REMARKS

Claims 1-59 remain pending. The rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully traversed below.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 11, 17, 26, 47 and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph due to the alleged indefiniteness related to the phrase "and/or." These claims were amended above to overcome these rejections by reciting "at least one of ... and ... ."

#### The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1 – 9, 11 – 20, 22 – 30 and 32 – 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over **Lau et al.** (USP 6,690,657). Claims 10, 21 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over **Lau** in view of **Mackay**(USP 6,600,727). However, it is submitted that the cited prior art does not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, all the features recited in the present claimed invention.

The primary reference to **Lau** merely discloses a repeater network, wherein a base station and a repeater has a master/slave relationship. The repeaters have added functionality for checking the signal strength received on multiple channels, repeating only the strongest received signal (*see e.g.* column 8, lines 6 – 10; and lines 20 – 24). A repeater may also have the added functionality of adjusting its output power, as a slave, in response to instructions from its master (network base station) through the control link 170 (*see e.g.* column 8, lines 51 – 62). A repeater may also have the added functionality, again in response to instructions by the base station

Application No.: 09/746,602  
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111 dated May 26, 2004  
Response to the Office Action of February 27, 2004

through the control link 170, to schedule a scan of its channels for interference sources, and to report back to the base station the scanned results (*see e.g.* column 8, line 63 - column 9, line 9). Other master/slave network arrangements are described using a Bluetooth protocol (*see e.g.* column 10, lines 38 - 58).

Nothing in the cited prior art teaches or suggest the present claimed features for *each* of a plurality of communication units having a monitoring and controlling unit that *monitors and controls the plurality of communication units*. In particular, the control circuit in each of the repeaters described in **Lau** merely monitors a signal strength of the channels it handles and controls which signal warrants repeating. In the embodiments having the added control link 170 to the base station, a repeater also has a control circuit that responds to instructions from the base station to either adjust its own transmission power and/or to scan channels. *Each* repeater described in **Lau** does not monitor and control any *plurality* of communication units.

It should be emphasized that the present invention is directed to an information processing device that interacts with a plurality of wireless communication devices in such a multiple wireless communication environment, the present claimed invention calls for *each* of a plurality of communication units to have its own monitoring and control unit that monitors and controls the *plurality* of communication units. The present claimed invention further recites *each* of these monitoring and control units as monitoring a communication state of *another one* of the plurality of communication units. The repeaters described in **Lau** only monitors the signal strengths it receives. Each repeater of **Lau** does not monitor any communication state of any *other* repeater.

Application No.: 09/746,602  
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111 dated May 26, 2004  
Response to the Office Action of February 27, 2004

The present claimed invention also recites adjusting a communication/transmission condition of the wireless transceiver of the *one* communication unit in accordance with the communication state monitored for *another/other* communication unit. Since none of the repeaters described in Lau monitors a communication state of *another* repeater, none of the repeaters described in Lau *adjusts* a communication/transmission condition of *one* communication unit in accordance with a monitored communication state of *another* communication unit.

Alternatively, some independent claims of the present invention recite adjusting a communication/transmission condition of the wireless transceiver of *one* communication unit "in accordance with an application activated in relation to the connection of said one communication unit *or device data of another information processing device with which said first information processing device is communicating*". Nothing in Lau teaches or suggests this alternative type of adjustment according to the present claimed invention.

More fundamentally, Lau does not even teach or suggest the present claimed information processing device that includes a plurality of communication units. As mentioned above, the present invention is directed to an information processing device handling multiple/different wireless communication functions. For example, a single information processing device 10 may include multiple communication units (*see e.g.*, 12, 13, 14, 15 in Figures 3, 8 and 10). In contrast, Lau is directed to a repeater *network*, wherein each node in a network (or each single information processing device) only contains just one "communication unit" each. There is no single information processing device disclosed in Lau having multiple communication units. This difference is reflective of the fact that Lau does not address the need to handle

Application No.: 09/746,602  
Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111 dated May 26, 2004  
Response to the Office Action of February 27, 2004

multiple/different wireless communication functions for a *single* information processing device, as described and claimed in the present invention.

For at least any one of these numerous reasons, it is submitted that the present invention patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully Submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



John P. Kong  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 40,054

JPK:kal  
1250 Connecticut Avenue  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 822-1100  
Q:\2000\001665\Filings\1.111 Amendment - May 2004.doc